

DEVELOPING SPEAKING MATERIALS BASED ON THE COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE (CEFR) FOR INCREASING THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL

Yuniarti

Ahmad Dahlan University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Email: yuniarti949@gmail.com

Abstract: This study was aimed to describe the steps of developing speaking materials based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for increasing the students' speaking skill of the A2 students of IDeA Indonesia, Metro, Lampung. This research included in research and development (R&D). The mixed-method was used in this research. The combinations of qualitative and quantitative techniques were used for analysing the data. The qualitative data were collected by conducting interviews, field notes, the teacher's feedback, observations and experts' comments. Interviews were conducted for gaining the students' needs analysis and evaluation of the materials. The quantitative data were collected by conducting questionnaires for needs analysis, trying out the materials and evaluating the materials. The data were analysed by using descriptive analysis with percentage. Based on the needs analysis, it was found out that the students need specific materials for speaking. In designing syllabus, the old syllabus must be improved and added with some practical speaking materials. There were eleven units in the handout. Each unit consisted of speaking materials, writing activities, spoken activities, notes and let's make summary. The students said that the developed materials was challenging and interesting. Two experts said that the materials were very good. The results of the materials implementation showed the improvements of the speaking score. The improvement of students' speaking score after implementing the handout was 38 scores for 15 students and the average of the score improvement was 2.53. The highest improvement score was 2 or 33.33%. This improvement indicated that the product or the designed materials for A2 students based on CEFR was effective to improve the students' speaking skill.

Keywords: *Development, speaking materials, CEFR, speaking skill*

INTRODUCTION

English is taught in Indonesia as a foreign language and compulsory subject across schools. Speaking skill is a major criterion in judging whether English students competencies are good or bad. In

speaking subject, the students should master the vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar and fluency.

Many students have problems with speaking skill. They cannot communicate actively and spontaneously with others in the

target language. Although they have enough vocabulary to express their ideas and feeling, they do not know how to say something in the target language. By knowing the problem of speaking in the classroom, the teacher can choose, adapt, and develop the materials that are suitable for their students in the classroom.

Based on the result of pre-survey, it was found that the teacher in IDeA Indonesia has problems in teaching speaking. The materials are limited since it is not easy to be found. Then, the materials are inappropriate with the students' need and their capability. The researcher developed speaking materials for increasing the students' speaking skill at the SIP students of IDeA Indonesia based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) in the academic year 2015/2016. The research problems are formulated as follows:

- a. What are the steps to develop the speaking materials based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for the SIP students of IDeA Indonesia?
- b. What is the form of the speaking materials based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for the SIP students of IDeA Indonesia?
- c. How far is the effectiveness of the speaking materials based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for the SIP students of IDeA Indonesia?

Due to the limited time, energy, and fund, this study will not talk about all the problems above. This study will only focus on developing speaking material based on the Common European

Framework of Reference (CEFR) for increasing speaking skill.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Speaking Material

The definition of material

Tomlinson (1998: 2) defines materials as anything which is used to help to teach language learners. According to Richards (2001: 252) there are authentic materials and create materials. Authentic materials refers to the use on teaching of the texts, photographs, video selections and other teaching resources that were not specially prepared for pedagogical purposes. Authentic materials are language and reflect tot the real world. Created material is specifically developed for teaching purposes.

The role of learning materials

Cunningsworth (1995: 7) in Richards summarizes the role of materials in language teaching as: (a) resource for presentation materials (spoken or written); (b) source of activities for learners practice and communicative interaction; (c) reference source for learners on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation; (d) source of stimulation and ideas for classroom activities; (e) syllabus (where they reflect learning objectives that have already been determined); (f) support of less experience for less experienced teachers who have yet to gain in confidence.

Materials design model

- a. The purpose of material design

Materials are a visible product activity regardless of whether such as activity is useful or even necessary (Hutchinson & Walters, 1994: 106).

- b. The kind of materials design
Hutchinson & Walters (1994: 96) present materials design as follows: (1) material evaluation; (2) material development and (3) material adaptation.

The principle of effective teaching materials

Crawford in Richards (2002:84-88) propose the principles for designing effective teaching materials are: (a) language is functional and must be contextualized; (b) the language used should be realistic and authentic; (c) classroom materials will usually seek to include an audio visual component; (d) learners need to develop the ability to deal with written as well as spoken genres; (e) materials need to be flexible enough to allow for individual and contextual differences and (f) learning needs to engage learners both affectively and cognitively.

The criteria of good materials

Tomlinson (1998: 7-21) explain good materials should help the learners to feel at ease, to achieve impact, to develop confidence, to be relevant for learners; to give the opportunity to achieve the communicative purposes, to cover all students' need and learning styles.

The materials design model

In this research, handout is chosen because handout can be designed for some developmental purposes. Bligh (1998: 1) points out that handout can be used to: (a) convey daily lecture or larger unit or chapter goals to students; (b) ensure that all students share the same basic background; (c) save time in containing content; (d) guide students through difficult

lecture material; (e) save note taking and (f) stimulate thought.

Review of the existing speaking materials

The existing speaking material used at that time is called paper created by the educational board of IDeA Indonesia in 2015. The basis in selecting the items is the insufficient portions of the items presented in the existing speaking materials. In other words, the items got (very) little part of discussion for speaking skill practices. Based on that analysis, the items are developed to become speaking materials based on A2 students of CEFR which are ready-to-use and provide more chance for students to practice their speaking skills.

The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)

Definition of CEFR

To address level of language proficiency, an international scale of language descriptors, the Common Framework of Reference (CFR), has been introduced to establish consistent standards for teaching, learning, and assessment. Saskatchewan (2013: 1) defines that The Common European Framework provides a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. The CEFR scale contains six Global Levels, ranging from the beginner level (A1) to the highest level of language proficiency (C2). The scale attaches importance to the breath of language acquisition in its recognition of five communicative skills: listening, spoken interaction, spoken production, reading, and writing.

Types of CEFR

According to Saskatchewan (2013: 3) there are two types of CEFR scales, CEFR Global Scale and The CEFR Can Do Scale. The CEFR scale contains six Global Levels, ranging from the beginner level (A1) to the highest level of language proficiency (C2). The CEFR Can Do Scale is essentially a self-assessment grid written in the first person and based on the Global Scale. Self-assessment statements outline the learner's roadmap to progress with language learning. The scale stresses learner autonomy through its action orientation.

The content of CEFR

Based on the Council of Europe CEFR (2002: 10), the content of CEFR covers broad aspects designed in systematic orders to meet various kinds of learning need as described as follows: (a) competences; (b) general competences; (c) communicative language competence; (d) context; (e) language activities; (f) language process; (g) text; (h) domain and (i) strategy.

The advantages of using CEFR

Vandergrift (2006: 8) classifies that CEFR emerged as the framework that meets the criteria for validity and is best suited to meet the needs of the students for the following reasons: (a) grounded in the most widely-accepted theory of language competence and language use; (b) it is empirically defined and ranked for a number of different languages; (c) it has a high degree of face validity with teachers; (d) the descriptors are transparent, user-friendly, and meaningful to teachers and to learners and (e) the level descriptors are context-free but context relevant, providing greater

flexibility to accommodate the different curricula.

NEED ANALYSIS

The definition of need analysis

Nunan (1988: 75) states that need analysis refers to a family of procedures for gathering information about learner and communication tasks for use in syllabus design. According to Macalister (2010: 24), need analysis is directed mainly at the goals and content of a course. It examines what the learners know already and what they need to know.

The purpose of need analysis

Richards (2001: 52) mentions some of the purposes of need analysis as follows: (a) to find out what language skills a learner needs; (b) to help determine course adequately; (c) to determine which students from group are most in need of training in particular language skills; (d) to identify a gap between what students are able to do and what they need to be able to do and (e) to collect information about a particular problem learners are experiencing.

The aspect of need analysis

Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 54) differentiate need analysis into two, namely target needs and learning needs. Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 55) state that target needs is something of an umbrella term which in practice, hides a number of important distinctions to look at the target need situation in terms of necessities, lacks and wants. According to Hutchinson and Waters (1994: 60-62), learning needs indicate the route: how the learners are going to know their starting point (lacks) and destination (necessities).

The users of need analysis

Richards (2001: 55) mentions some users of need analysis such as (a) curriculum officer in the ministry of education; (b) teachers; (c) learners; (d) researchers; (e) testing personnel and (f) staff of tertiary instruction. In this research, the users of need analysis are the teacher, learners and the researcher who create the handout.

Gathering information about target needs

Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 58) show the number of ways in which information can be gathered about need are questionnaire, interviews, observation, data collection, informal consultations with sponsors, learners and others.

DEVELOPING MATERIALS

In the material development, there requirements to make material develop are feasibility study, content and organization.

Feasibility study

Hofstrand (2009: 1) defines that a feasibility study is an analysis of the viability of an idea. Deborah (2010: 2) explains that the feasibility studies are used to determine whether an intervention is appropriate for testing and to assess whether or not the ideas can be shaped to be relevant or sustainable.

Claase (2012: 2) points out that the aim of feasibility study is to examine and/or evaluate the possible future success or failure of the research. There are six stages of feasibility study in research development: (a) determine the prerequisites; (b) identify target audiences' information needs; (c)

specify the type of research; (d) determine the requirements for feasibility study reporting; (e) search for relevant information and (f) present feasibility study results.

Content

In the content of material development, need analysis, presentation and evaluation are needed for creating a good handout. According to Macalister (2010: 24), need analysis is directed mainly at the goals and content of a course. In presentation, the teachers' presentation in the classroom by using the handout is asked whether effective, appropriate or not. This handout is evaluated by the expert judgments and the teachers of IDeA Indonesia. This research discussed much on the speaking skill because the purpose of the research was to develop English speaking materials for the A2 students based on CEFR.

Organization

The speaking material is developed based on the result of need analysis and the atmosphere of the school. Materials are designed based on the curriculum. The curriculum develops into syllabus design, program implementation and classroom implementation. The handout is designed in eleven units for a month. English speaking materials are developed include listening, reading and writing skill as well. However, the three other skills are minimized as little as possible so the speaking skill can be optimized during the class.

TEACHING SPEAKING SKILL

The definition of teaching speaking

Sauvignon (2001:14, via Celce) states that speaking skill one of the four language skills; listening, speaking, reading and writing. According to Cameron (2001: 40) speaking is the active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them. In other words, speaking is used to share meaning. According to Harmer (2003: 250) the teaching of productive skills is closely bound up with receptive skills work. The two feed off each other in a number of ways. The integration of skills can be found in the teaching and learning activities of the research product developed by the researcher.

The aspects of teaching speaking

Teaching speaking is classified into seven aspects, they are:

a. Fluency

Lado (1961: 240) points out that speaking ability is described as the ability to report acts or situation, in precise words, or the ability to converse a sequence of ideas fluently.

b. Pronunciation

Thornbury (2005: 128-129) states that pronunciation refers to the student's ability to produce comprehensible utterances to fulfill the task requirements. Harmer (2001: 28-33) provides more issues related to pronunciation which are pitch, intonation, individual sounds, sounds and spelling, and stress.

c. Grammar

Brown (2001: 362) states that grammar is the system of rules, governing the conventional arrangement and the relationship of words in a sentence. In relation to contexts, a speaker should

consider the following things: (1) who the speaker is; (2) who the audience is; (3) where the communication takes place; (4) what communication takes place before and after a sentence in question; (5) implied versus literal meaning; (6) styles and registers; (7) the alternative forms among which a produce can choose.

d. Vocabulary

According to Richards (2002: 255), vocabulary is the core component of language proficiency and provides much of the basis for how well learners speak, listen, read, and write. Richards and Schmidt (2002: 580) state that vocabulary is a set of lexeme, including single words, compound words, and idioms.

e. Interactive communication

Based on Thornbury (2005: 129), interactive communication refers to the ability of a candidate to interact with the interlocutor and the other candidates by initiating and responding appropriately and at the required speed and rhythm to fulfill the task requirements.

f. Appropriateness

When people are communicating they have to see what effects to achieve the communicative purpose. Harmer (2001: 24) defines the term of appropriateness is related to some variables: (1) setting; (2) participants; (3) gender; (4) channel and (5) topic.

g. Complexity

Halliday (1985: 87) states it is wrong that written language

is highly organized, structured, and complex while spoken is disorganized, fragmentary, and simple. Nunan (2004: 86) argues that what made speaking difficult were related to the type of information that had to be conveyed and were concerned the scale of the task and interrelationships among the different elements involved.

Speaking activities

According to Harmer (2007: 124-131) speaking activities include: (a) photographic competition for upper intermediate to advance; (b) role-play for intermediate to upper intermediate; (c) the portrait; (d) information gap activities and (e) telling stories. Thornbury (2005: 95) suggest other activities to learners in learning speaking; they are describing their favorite objects, doing survey by interviewing their friends, doing presentation, balloon debate, moral dilemmas and so on.

Assessing speaking

a. Types of spoken test

Thornbury (2005: 125-126) shows the most commonly types of spoken test, namely: interview, live monologues (the candidate prepare and present a short talk on the pre-selected topic), recorded monologues, role-plays, collaborative tasks and discussion. The CEFR Grid for Speaking Tests is designed to assist language test developers in describing, creating and reviewing tests of oral production.

b. Assessment criteria

According to Thornbury (2005: 127), there are two main ways to assess the learners

speaking ability. They are holistic scoring which is giving it a single score on the basis of an overall impression and the analytic scoring which is giving a separate score for different aspect of the task.

REVIEW OF RELEVANT STUDIES

CEFR have been proven to be able to improve the students' speaking skill. As EvrimUstunluoglu (2012) had done a study on it, the conduction in language program evaluations are to examine the match between what is desired for the program versus the actual state of the program, they found that CEF Based Curriculum can gain significant relationship between students' proficiency scores and perception of their own competencies and a significant difference in perception of their own competence in terms of levels at the preparatory program.

In addition, Ismail HakkiMirici (2015), concludes that the EPOSTL is helpful in developing student teachers' metacognitive strategies as autonomous learners, which is a key factor in becoming teachers of foreign languages adopting the CEFR and the ELP principles in their classes.

Conceptual Framework

The effective teaching and learning process needs professional teacher, the set of appropriate syllabus and materials, method and media, good evaluation system, the effective supervision and solution for emerge obstacles. For that reason, the speaking materials for the students of IDeA Indonesia should meet learners' need which is appropriate with their study and the world of work to face the global competition.

The designs of the speaking materials are preceded by need analysis and then followed the diagnosis of the learner's need to determine the objective of language teaching and learning. In this study, the researchers designed the speaking materials for the students of IDeA Indonesia by using CEFR.

METHOD

Research Design

This research is classified as educational Research and Development (R&D) category since its purpose is to develop and validate a particular educational product (Borg and Gall, 1983; 772).

Place and Time of the Research

This research is carried out at the Super Integrated Program (SIP) IDeA Indonesia, Metro, Lampung in the Academic year of 2015/2016. There are seventeen students in SIP which are classed into SIP A, SIP B, SIP C and SIP D.

Feasibility Study

There were three methods of collecting data for this study used by the researcher. They are questionnaires, interview guidelines, and observation guides.

Data Collecting Technique

In this research, there are two types of data that should be collected; quantitative data and qualitative data. The quantitative data are collected through questionnaire. To collect qualitative data, three different instruments were used. They were the first questionnaire, interview guides, and observation guides.

Data Analysis Technique

Since the data is in numerical form, statistical analysis was applied and analyzed quantitatively from questionnaire, interview and observation test.

Research Procedures

The combination procedure of two models proposed by Dick & Carey (2003: 571) and Tomlinson (1998: 247) was used. The procedure were conducting need analysis, writing the syllabus and designing the units, writing the materials (first draft), consulting the materials, revising the first draft, implementing the second draft, evaluating and revising the materials, writing the final materials.

Result of the Research

The result of the research takes the form of a handout. There are eleven units in the handout. The content of the material talks about speaking skill based on CEFR which is appropriate with the syllabus.

Expert Judgment

An interview with English language teaching (ELT) expert who functioned as the assessor was done to evaluate the appropriateness of the learning media. Sugiyono (2012: 125) states that an expert must have been a doctor in his/ her field of research. Moreover, he adds that expert will give decision: the media will be used without revision, with some revision, and all revised. In this research, the ELT and R&D expert was needed to give judgment in the research in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the designed material. The result of judgment was used as the reference in designing and revising the speaking handout that should match with the students' need.

This research is classified as educational Research and Development (R&D) category since its purpose is to develop and validate a particular educational product (Borg and Gall, 1983: 772).

In this research, there are two types of data that should be collected; quantitative data and qualitative data. The quantitative data are collected through questionnaire. To collect qualitative data, three different instruments were used. They were the first questionnaire, interview guides, and observation guides. Since the data is in numerical form, statistical analysis was applied and analysed quantitatively from questionnaire, interview and observation test.

The combination procedure of two models proposed by Dick & Carey (2003: 571) and Tomlinson (1998: 247) was used. The procedure were conducting need analysis, writing the syllabus and designing the units, writing the materials (first draft), consulting the materials, revising the first draft, implementing the second draft, evaluating and revising the materials, writing the final materials.

Result

The result of the research takes the form of a handout. There are eleven units in the handout. The content of the materials talk about speaking skill based on CEFR which is appropriate with the syllabus.

The need analysis elements result based on the Munby's in Mehdi HaseliSonghori (2008: 31) are as follows:

Table 1
Students' Need Analysis

No	Elements	Explanation
1	Participants	The students of SIP A are chosen as the sample research. There are 10 female

		students and 5 male students aged between 15 to 17 years old. The students use English as the daily communication.
2	Communication need processor competences	As IDeA Indonesia students, they will have to deal with the achievement of some competences for supporting their capability in using English as daily conversation.
3	The language skills selector	The selections of language skill are appropriate with the language skills commonly or mostly used in the targeted competences.
4	The linguistic encoder	Communication based on gambits and right grammar.
5	The communicative competence specification	The English communicative competences are made appropriate with the targeted competences of the IDeA Indonesia students.

The result of the needs analysis showed that 100% of the students strongly agree to the necessity in studying speaking skill. 100% of the students strongly agree to the specific themes in learning speaking. Meanwhile, 80% students strongly agree and 20% students agree to have some examples of speaking. For vocabulary and grammar aspect, 63% students strongly agree, 27% students agree, 13% students disagree and 7% students are in doubt. Then, 73% students strongly agree and 27% students agree to have various expression of conversation. For specific materials in speaking, 87% students strongly agree and 13% students agree. In containing media to learn speaking, 80% students strongly

agree and 20% students agree. In evaluating the existing materials, 53% students agree, 26% students disagree and 21% students were in doubt. For gaining the suitable speaking materials 80% students strongly agree and 20% students agree. Then, 100% students strongly agree to have challenging materials.

An interview with English Language Teaching (ELT) expert who functioned as the assessor was done to evaluate the appropriateness of the learning media. Sugiyono (2012: 125) states that an expert must have been a doctor in his/her field of research. Moreover, he adds that expert will give decision: the media will be used without revision, with some revision, and all revised. In this research, the ELT and R&D expert was needed to give judgment in the research in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the designed material. The result of judgment was used as the reference in designing and revising the speaking handout that should match with the students' need.

After conducting the need analysis, the researcher designed a syllabus for a month in 11 units, they are (1) requesting; (2) inviting; (3) preference; (4) offering; (5) talking about abilities; (6) expression like and dislike; (7) expressing possibility; (8) talking about location; (9) asking and giving direction; (10) talking about travel and (11) description. The materials of speaking are divided into eleven units. Each unit consists of the following parts: (1) speaking materials; (2) writing activities; (3) spoken activities; (4) notes and (5) let's make a summary.

After the application of the materials, the researcher then observed the result of the post-test. The researcher found some

improvement of the students' speaking skill.

Table 2
The students' post-test improvement score

No	Student's name	Pre-test score	Post-test score	Score improvement
1	FH	20	21	1
2	SV	20	21	1
3	DR	21	22	1
4	SW	18	20	2
5	AN	20	22	2
6	BM	21	23	2
7	NH	22	24	2
8	YN	23	25	2
9	PL	21	24	3
10	SS	23	26	3
11	TJ	23	26	3
12	DS	24	28	4
13	DA	20	24	4
14	KR	22	26	4
15	RM	24	28	4
	Total score	332	360	38
	Mean	21.47	24.00	2.53

The results above indicate that the students got the improvements of the speaking score. The improvement of students' speaking skill after implementing the handout is 38 scores for 15 students. It means that the average of the score improvement is 2.53. The highest improvement score was 2 or 33.33%. This indicates that the product or the designed materials for A2 students based on CEFR was effective to improve the students' speaking skill.

The questionnaires were given to the experts to give the measurement of the speaking materials designed. This questionnaire consisted of four aspect, namely content appropriateness, language utilization, organization and presentation. In this questionnaire, the score was set in four scale, namely strongly agree (5), agree (4), enough (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1). While the result of the questionnaire was analysed using marking scheme 1 to 220 described as

follows: 121-145 is not good, 146-170 is enough, 171-195 is good and 196-220 is very good.

While applying the materials in the class, the researcher tried to find feedbacks and evaluations from the experts. The researcher provided questionnaires sheets for two experts. The questionnaires were in the form of optional questions for the experts. The questionnaires were given to gain the feedback of the designed materials.

Table 4
The description of the expert evaluators

Group of respondents	Male	Female	Educational background	Teaching experiences								
				< 7	8	9	10	>10				
Expert A: An English teaching expert (English lecturer)	√		Doctoral degree					14	The materials are designed for covering integrated learning.	5	4	
								15				The materials are applicable.
								16				The materials are designed in the interesting illustration and pictures.
								17				The handout appearance is interesting.
								18				The handout is designed in the readable font and interesting colors.
Expert B: An English teacher of IDeA Indonesia		√	Bachelor degree	√				19	The font is suitable and not too much.	5	5	
								20	The colors for the font are simple.			
								21	The illustration used is appropriate with the materials.			
Name and title of the evaluator: EkaSenjaWati, S.Pd. She is an English teacher from IDeA Indonesia. She had some teaching experiences in some other places in Lampung. She has been teaching English for 3 years.									22	The illustrations are created in the esthetical and functional materials.	5	5

Table 5
The Result of Experts' Questionnaires

No	Statements	Expert A	Expert B
1	The topics are appropriate for A2 students.	4	5
2	The materials are based on CEFR.	4	4
3	The materials are developed based on gambits.	5	4
4	The materials are designed in the communication practices.	4	5
5	The materials are designed in the simple	4	4

6	and clear instruction. The handout is designed in appropriate English grammar.	4	5
7	The handout is designed in appropriate spelling.	4	4
8	The handout is designed in appropriate word choice.	4	4
9	The materials are arranged in sequence.	4	5
10	The materials are appropriate with the syllabus.	5	4
11	The materials are focused on speaking skill.	4	4
12	The materials are interesting for practicing speaking skill.	5	5
	The materials are designed for covering integrated learning.	5	4
	The materials are applicable.	4	4
	The materials are designed in the interesting illustration and pictures.	5	5
	The handout appearance is interesting.	4	4
	The handout is designed in the readable font and interesting colors.	5	5
	The font is suitable and not too much.	5	5
	The colors for the font are simple.	5	4
	The illustration used is appropriate with the materials.	5	5
	The illustrations are created in the esthetical and functional materials.	5	5
	The illustrations are designed proportionally.	5	4
The total score		99	98
The total score of expert A and B		207	

The result of the experts' questionnaire above showed that the total score which is given by expert A and B were 207. Based on the rating scale for this questionnaire, it can be concluded that the handout of speaking materials based on the Common European Framework of

Reference is very good. Thus, this speaking handout is suitable for A2 students.

CONCLUSION

This research was aimed to develop speaking materials for increasing the speaking skill of the students of IDeA Indonesia. It was one of the fields in English for specific purposes teaching. The research was done in eight steps, namely (1) conducting needs analysis; (2) writing the syllabus and designing the units; (3) writing the first draft; (4) consulting the first draft; (5) revising the first draft; (6) implementing the second draft; (7) evaluating and revising the second draft and (8) writing the third draft as the final draft.

The form of speaking materials based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for A2 students of IDeA Indonesia in this research was handout which is designed in 11 units and consisted of the following subtopics: speaking materials, writing activities, spoken activities, notes and let's make a summary.

The improvement of students' speaking skill after implementing the handout is 38 scores for 15 students. It means that the average of the score improvement is 2.53. The highest improvement score was 2 or 33.33%. This indicates that the product or the designed materials for A2 students based on CEFR was effective to improve the students' speaking skill.

REFERENCES

- Bano, Y. 2005. *Curriculum and Textbooks: Issues and Challenges in Pakistan*.
- ANTERIEP Newsletter, 10 (1), 3-8).
- Borg, D. M and Gall. 1996. *Educational Research, an Introduction*, Sixth Edition, New York: Longman Publisher White Plains
- Brewster, J. E. G and Girard, D. 1991. *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. London: Penguin Group.
- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. White Plains, New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burn, A. and Joyce, H. 1997. *Focus on Speaking*. Macquaire: Macquaire University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.
- Chaney, A.L. 1998. *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Boston: Allyn& Bacon.
- Claase, M. 2012. *Optimizing Feasibility Studies: Based on a Grounded Theory Type Comparison of Feasibility Design Research*. Boston: University of Twente.
- Cunningsworth, A.1984. *Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching Materials*. London: Heinemann.
- Cunningsworth, A.1995. *Choosing your Coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.

- Dawson, C. 2007. *A Practical Guide to Research Methods*, Third Edition. London: Spring Hill House Begbroke. *Centered Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deborah, J.B. 2010. *How to Design Feasibility Studies*. London: National Institutes of Health. Am J Prev. *Centered Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gall, et.al. 1996. *Educational Research, an Introduction, Sixth Edition*. New York: Longman Publisher
- Gay, L, R. 1992. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*, 4th edition. Toronto: Maxwell, McMillan Publishing Company.
- Government of Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. 2013. *A Guide to Using the Common Framework of Reference (CFR) with Learners of English as an Additional Language*.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2000. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Longman University Press.
- _____. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Longman University Press.
- _____. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3rd edition. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hutchinson, Tom and Waters, Alan. 1994. *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning*
- _____. 2007. *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning*
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 1993. *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Blackwell
- Nunan, D. 2003. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J.C and Rodgers, S. T. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, Brian. 2008. *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trim, John. 2014. *Using the CEFR: Principles of Good Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weijdema, Willy. 2005. *International Standards in the Assessment of Teacher Trainees' Language Proficiency in the Netherlands*. The Netherlands: Hogeschool van Amsterdam

Thornbury, S. 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. Pearson: Pearson Longman Inc.

Widdowson, H.G. 1994. *Teaching language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.